



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,586	02/09/2001	Leonard S. Girsh	4403-9 D12	1293

23557 7590 08/29/2003

SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK
A PROFESSIONAL-ASSOCIATION
2421 N.W. 41ST STREET
SUITE A-1
GAINESVILLE, FL 326066669

EXAMINER

SHERRER, CURTIS EDWARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/781,586

Applicant(s)

GIRSH, LEONARD S.

Examiner

Curtis E. Sherrer

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/19/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 62-95 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 82-95 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 62-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 82-95 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Further, applicant elected to prosecute the claimed species directed to treating food. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 62-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The new claims recite the use of super critical or critical liquid nitrogen and no specification basis for this limitation was found.

New claims 62-67 recite the limitation of "reducing the pathogenicity" and after a cursory review of lengthy specification, no basis was found.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 62-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 62-81 are indefinite because the scope of the phrase "food-derived product" is unknown.

Claims 63 and 66 are indefinite because they appear to claim the same invention and therefore it is not clear how they provide further limitation(s).

Claim 68 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase "essentially hypoallergenic" is unknown.

Claim 81 indefinite because the scope of the phrase "the functionality of the fat is enhanced" is unknown.

Claims 71 and 72 are indefinite because the scope of the term "about" is unknown.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by applicant's admissions (specification, page 8-9).

Applicant admits that "[l]iquid nitrogen has been used in the food industry to freeze foods and to cryogenically grind foods. For freezing, foods are typically immersed in liquid nitrogen

Art Unit: 1761

for a few (1-15) seconds,” Applicant continues to discuss the use of liquid nitrogen for grinding spices and use with ground meat. It is inherent that the patented process will obtain the claimed attributes of the final products.

The Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants’ product with the product of the prior art in order to establish that the product of the prior art does not possess the same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the burden is upon the applicant to prove that the claimed inventions are functionally different than those taught by the prior art and to establish patentable differences. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 U.S.P.Q. 430 (CCPA 1977); *Ex parte Gray*, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1922, 1923 (BPAI).

Claims 62-70, 73, 74, 76 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tallafus (U.S. Pat. No. 5,193,350).

Tallafus teaches the sterilizing of dried goods, such as herbs, teas, spices and drugs in order to destroy “adult organisms.” (Col. 1, lines 5-9). “[S]terilization can be achieved within seconds if the goods are exposed directly to liquid refrigeration gas (liquid nitrogen) but that with a core temperature for the package of minus 25 C, an exposure time of about four hours is required.” (Col. 3, lines 30-37). It is inherent that the patented process will obtain the claimed attributes of the final products. See *In re Best*, above.

Claims 62-70, and 76-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,848,094)(“Davis”).

Art Unit: 1761

Davis teaches the treatment of milk in Example 1, whereby liquid nitrogen is contacted with drops of milk. It is inherent that the patented process will obtain the claimed attributes of the final products. Again, see *In re Best*, above

Claims 62-72, and 76, and 80-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawashima (JP Pat. No. 358210023).

Kawashima teaches the treatment of medicinal plants, such as herbs, mushrooms, etc. with liquid nitrogen to facilitate the fine pulverization of the plant. Again see *In re Best*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis.

Davis teaches that cited above, but does not specifically teach the use of defatted milk. The production of defatted milk, i.e., skim or fat free milk, is notoriously well known and therefore it would have been obvious to use a defatted milk in the process of Davis.

Applicants' attention is invited to *In re Levin*, 84 U.S.P.Q. 232 and the cases cited therein, which are considered in point in the fact situation of the instant case, and wherein the Court stated on page 234 as follows:

Art Unit: 1761

This court has taken the position that new recipes or formulas for cooking food which involve the addition or elimination of common ingredients, or for treating them in ways which differ from the former practice, do not amount to invention, merely because it is not disclosed that, in the constantly developing art of preparing food, no one else ever did the particular thing upon which the applicant asserts his right to a patent. In all such cases, there is nothing patentable unless the applicant by a proper showing further establishes a coaction or cooperative relationship between the selected ingredients which produces a new, unexpected, and useful function. *In re Benjamin D. White*, 17 C.C.P.A (Patents) 956, 39 F.2d 974, 5 U.S.P.Q. 267; *In re Mason et al.*, 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1144, 156 F.2d 189, 70 U.S.P.Q. 221.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis E. Sherrer whose telephone number is 703-308-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 8AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3602 for regular communications and 703-305-3602 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Curtis E. Sherrer
Primary Examiner
August 22, 2003